

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Vo

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/111,041	07/07/98	SANDIFER	M 032892ATP

WILLIAM C MILKS III
4746 WOODVIEW DRIVE
SANTA ROSA CA 95405

LM01/0930

EXAMINER

LINTZ, P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2771

3

DATE MAILED:

09/30/98

09/30/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/111,041

Applicant(s)
Sandifer

Examiner
Paul R. Lintz

Group Art Unit
2771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 7, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 8-19 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 15-19 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 8-14 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Paul R. Lintz
Primary Examiner

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

1. Claims 8-19 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The Specification is objected as having an improper Appendix. The only provision made for an Appendix in a United States Patent Application is for a computer listing Appendix. Accordingly, Applicant must remove all references to "Appendix A" in the Specification and either cancel Appendix A or bodily incorporate it into the text of the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. (US 5,195,173).
5. As to claim 8, Gordon taught the invention as claimed, with the exception that Gordon et al. Did not teach the form editor being under control of the user.
6. Gordon taught: a): a system to provide information to maintain and repair equipment, comprising knowledge-based access to and management of a technical database (**Column 2, line 25-33**); b) displayable publications (**Figure 1**); c) a list of forms would have been inherent in Gordon et al.'s multi-form system; d) an editor for filling in the forms (**Column 3, lines 48-55; Column 6, lines 4-9**).
7. Gordon et al were silent as to whether the editor was under control of the user.
8. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art of programming to make the editor under control of the user because that would have allowed useful user annotations to have been input as modifications to the forms.

9. As to claim 9, although Gordon et al. Were silent as to whether the selection list had form number, revision, revision date, and title; however, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art of computer programming to have programmed such a feature because Gordon et al.'s invention had applications to regulatory compliance with the Interstate Commerce Commission which regulates Interstate Trucking and their forms would have included the standard government designations such as form number, revision, revision date and title.
10. As to claim 10, Gordon et al.'s invention used a mouse (**Column 3, line 28-36**).
11. As to claim 11, Gordon et al.'s invention assisted the user to fill in forms (**Column 6, lines 4-9**).
12. As to claim 12, Gordon et al. Disclosed a printer (**10 Figure 1**).
13. As to claim 13 and 14, Gordon et al. Did not disclose an aircraft maintenance system or FAA forms; however, it would have been obvious to have applied Gordon et al.'s invention to aircraft maintenance, using FAA forms because the aircraft maintenance problem was also subject to similar type of safety and maintenance regulations as the trucking industry and the forms of ICC covered some of the same type of routine maintenance as FAA forms (e.g. Brake overhaul vs engine overhaul).

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 15-19 are allowed.
15. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: In claim 15, the tying of the electronic logbook function to revision selection list for updating maintenance required based upon revisions to the publications, taken together with the other limitations of claim 15, were not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record. The claims further dependent upon claim 15, being further limiting, definite, and fully enabled by the Specification, are also allowed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

PRIOR ART MADE OF REFERENCE

16. Gordon et al. (US 5,195,173) was used to reject claims 15-19.
17. Yakish et al. (US 5,563,998) disclosed a Forms automation system. The Abstract and Disclosure are relevant.
18. Lewis (US 5,666,481) disclosed a system for providing maintenance in a communication network. The Abstract and Disclosure are relevant.
19. Skorupski et al. (US 5,680,328) disclosed a computerized vehicle maintenance reporting system using a small on-board computer and a ground support station. The Abstract and Disclosure are relevant.
20. Sandifer (US 5,778,381) is the parent patent. The Abstract and Disclosure are relevant.

POINTS OF CONTACT

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Paul R. Lintz whose telephone number is (703) 305-3832. The Examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 8:00 am until 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached at (703) 305-9707. The fax phone number for Art Unit 2307 is (703) 305-9731.. NOTE: Documents transmitted by facsimile will be entered as official documents on the file wrapper unless clearly marked "DRAFT".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)


Or:

(703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



**Paul R. Lintz
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2307
September 24, 1998**



**Paul R. Lintz
Primary Examiner**